Qeios

Peer Review

Review of: "Human Artistic Discernment as an Evaluative Criterion in the Age of Artificial Intelligence"

Ana Daniela Rebelo-Verboom[1]

1. University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal

This paper takes on a question that is both timely and genuinely important: as artificial intelligence becomes more deeply embedded in academic and artistic evaluation, what is the proper role of human judgment, and how do we articulate its value without either dismissing it as mere subjectivity or overreaching in claims about its measurability? The author's instinct to approach this through a dual framework — philosophical and methodological — is thoughtful, and the choice to ground the discussion in artistic discernment gives the paper a distinctive focus. There is a worthwhile contribution here, and I hope the following suggestions help the author bring it more fully to light.

1. Engagement with recent scholarship

One of the most important steps the author could take to strengthen this paper is to engage more fully with scholarship from the last three to four years. Given that the paper positions itself squarely within contemporary debates about artificial intelligence, readers will naturally look for dialogue with the current state of those debates. The theoretical background as it stands draws largely on foundational texts from the mid-twentieth century through the early 2000s, which are valuable touchstones, but the field has developed considerably since then. There is a rich and growing literature on generative AI evaluation, human-AI complementarity in assessment, and algorithmic fairness in cultural and academic contexts that would speak directly to the paper's concerns. Incorporating at least five to eight recent references from 2022 to 2025 would not only update the theoretical background but also allow the author to position the paper's contribution more precisely within ongoing conversations in the field.

2. Clarity and structure of research goals

doi.org/10.32388/9TL2ZG

The paper's aims come through in the introduction, but they would benefit from being stated more concisely and then carried forward more explicitly throughout the manuscript. A brief, clearly worded statement of objectives — perhaps reinforced in a dedicated research design or methods section — would help readers follow the argument and understand how each part of the paper contributes to the whole. The two aims the paper pursues (philosophical analysis and methodological illustration) are quite different in character, and giving each a clearly marked space in the structure would make the paper's logic considerably easier to follow. At the moment, the transition between these two modes of inquiry can feel somewhat abrupt.

3. Precision in key concepts

The paper's writing is often engaging, and the ideas it reaches for are interesting, but there are moments where greater precision would make the argument more convincing. The phrase "a form of judgment that exhibits discernible patterns capable of partial methodological articulation," for instance, carries a great deal of weight in the paper's central argument, and readers would benefit from a clearer unpacking of what "partial methodological articulation" actually means in practice — what specifically can be articulated, what cannot, and how that boundary is determined. Similarly, terms like "philosophical singularity" and "methodological visibility" appear frequently and would benefit from clear definitions at the point of introduction. These are not criticisms of the underlying ideas, which are genuinely promising, but rather an encouragement to give them the precise conceptual framing they deserve.

4. On the use of simulated data

This point deserves careful attention, as it has implications for how the paper's empirical claims should be understood. The statistical results presented in Section 3.3 — including Kendall's W, Cronbach's α, and Rasch model findings — are derived from data the author constructed for illustrative purposes, as noted in the footnote to Table 1. This is a reasonable choice for a conceptual paper, but it creates a tension that the manuscript does not fully address. Statistical analyses run on invented data reflect the assumptions built into that data, not patterns observed in the real world. The reported values would have been different had the data been constructed differently, which means they cannot serve as evidence for how artistic discernment actually behaves in evaluative practice. This does not undermine the paper's conceptual argument, but it does mean the methodological section needs to be reframed more carefully. The author might consider presenting this section explicitly as a theoretical illustration or proof of concept, making clear throughout that the results are hypothetical and that the framework would need to be tested with real expert rating data before any empirical conclusions could be drawn. This kind of

transparency would actually strengthen the paper, as it would clarify the nature and scope of the contribution and open an honest conversation about what the next steps for the research program might look like.

5. A few further observations

The paper's conclusion argues persuasively for a cooperative model of human and AI evaluation, which is a nuanced and appealing position. However, the theoretical background at times slips back into framing discernment as a "final stronghold" against algorithmic encroachment, which sits in some tension with that more collaborative conclusion. Revisiting this framing for consistency would sharpen the paper's overall argument. Additionally, the methods section introduces a range of analytical techniques — AHP, entropy weighting, G-theory, confirmatory factor analysis — that are each interesting in their own right, but their interaction and combined rationale could be explained more fully. A more integrated account of how these tools work together would make the methodological framework feel more coherent. Addressing these issues in a revised submission would significantly strengthen the manuscript and be reflected in a higher evaluation.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.